

S/N 09/755,863

REMARKS

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the rejection states that the specification does not support the limitation "applying... by selecting the other cell" (emphasis added). The applicants respectfully traverse that rejection.

The specification at page 16, lines 9-16, provides support for the limitation questioned by the Examiner. The specification there states that when a user clicks on an entry in the results list 1002 (Fig. 10), the application moves the display to the selected cell reference. Clicking the replace tab with a single or multiple selected cells applies the selected replacement text and/or formatting to the selected cell. The applicants submit that Claim 23 finds support in that portion of their specification.

Turning to art-based rejections, all claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over *Underdahl* in view of *WordPerfect*, alone or in combination with certain other secondary references. ("*Underdahl*", in the present rejections, includes certain pages that were newly cited with the Office action dated January 11, 2006.) The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Because the applicants base this traversal on the Examiner's interpretation of *Underdahl*, the following remarks apply to all the art rejections.

Claim 2 defines a computer-implemented method including choosing the plurality of formatting characteristics of a spreadsheet cell "in response to...clicking a mouse button to select the cell, whereby in response to selecting the cell the formatting characteristics of the selected cell are determined and applied to the plurality of fields of the find dialog" (emphasis added). The rejection of Claims 2 *et al.* states (paragraphs 10 and 20 of the last Office action) that *Underdahl* discloses moving a cursor over a cell in a

S/N 09/755,863

spreadsheet containing plural formatting characteristics and clicking a mouse button to select the cell "whereby in response to selecting the cell the formatting characteristics of a selected cell are determined and applied to the plurality of fields of the dialog" (emphasis added). In fact, *Underdahl* lacks support for that emphasized portion of the Examiner's rejection.

Page 193 of *Underdahl* states,

"to change the display format of a cell or block, first highlight the cell or block, then click the right mouse button inside the cell or block... to open the Active Block Object Inspector dialog box. The Numeric Format pane is selected by default. If no Numeric Format has been assigned, the default General Format is checked, as shown in figure 6.7."

Page 193 of *Underdahl* then instructs the user to "type the number of decimal places in the text box that appears after you choose one of these formats. Quattro Pro 6... suggests a default of 2 decimal places, but you can type another number... Choose OK to confirm the dialog box and apply the format to the highlighted cell or block." (emphasis added).

Underdahl thus discloses the following steps:

- (1) highlight a cell or block;
- (2) right-click the cell or block to open a dialog box;
- (3) type the desired formatting into the dialog box;
- (4) choose OK to confirm the dialog box and apply the format to the highlighted cell or block.

It should now be understood that *Underdahl* does not determine formatting characteristics of the selected cell and apply those formatting characteristics to fields in a dialog box. To the contrary, *Underdahl* discloses the mirror-opposite, namely, selecting

S/N 09/755,863

a cell, next opening (by right clicking) a dialog box referencing the selected cell, and then entering *in that dialog box* the formatting desired for the selected cell or block. The operation disclosed by *Underdahl* is thus contrary to the requirement of Claim 2, namely, "whereby in response to selecting the cell the formatting characteristics of the selected cell are determined and applied to the plurality of fields of the find dialog."

Given what *Underdahl* actually discloses as explained above, that reference fails to teach an element of the invention claimed by the applicants. That missing element is not found or suggested in the other cited references. Accordingly, Claims 2 *et al.* define a computer-implemented method and a computer-readable medium, respectively, that would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the applicants made their invention. For that reason, the rejections based on *Underdahl* should be withdrawn and the present application passed to issue.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. The applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application.



Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: April 5, 2006

Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100